

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A395

Panama Canal: Buzzards Coming Home To RoostEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. FRANK T. BOW**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful article by William S. White in the January 21, 1964, issue of the News of Lynchburg, Va., supplies some highly pertinent discussion of the Panama Canal question.

In comparing the situations at the Suez Canal in 1956 with that at Panama today, it must never be overlooked that they are entirely different. The Suez Canal Co. was an Egyptian corporation started by private commercial interests. The Panama Canal enterprise is an agency of our Government under the President in Canal Zone, over which the United States was granted complete sovereignty and in which all land and property was purchased by our country from individual owners. Our country is obligated by treaties and bound by law to the principle of the perpetual operation of the Panama Canal.

The article follows:

BUZZARDS COMING HOME TO ROOST
(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Some unpleasantly buzzardlike chickens are coming home to roost, with Panama as their current roosting ground, from the United Nations decision of 1956 to condemn an attempt to halt the seizure, in the name of "anticolonialism," of another international canal.

To its lasting shame, the U.S. Government, under Republican President Eisenhower but with no effective protest from the Democrats, then joined the Soviet Union in branding as "aggression" the effort of the British, French, and Israelis to strike the throttling hands of Nasser Egypt from the Suez Canal.

But, far worse, the U.N. definition of "aggression" thus adopted and embedded as historic precedent was so oversimplified as positively to invite similar international thefts—so long as the real aggressor, the grabber of the property of others, could claim to be acting under the sacred banner of anticolonialism.

For the U.N. said, in effect, that when one power crossed the frontiers of another, moving only against unarguable, imminent and mortal peril to itself, it was automatically wrong even though it could only hope to save its life or vital interests precisely by moving first.

This in substance destroyed the basic doctrine of national self-defense as a valid plea in the United Nations—so long as the country or countries offering that plea were less popular than their antagonists. Self-defense is a sour fiction if one must knowingly wait until he has been destroyed before taking the one action that might have saved himself.

Now, there is, of course, no imminent threat of a seizure of the Panama Canal, which is the property of the United States under a treaty in existence for six decades. All current signs indicate that the crisis there may be, for the time being, surmounted by our agreement to allow Panamanian guards to police the boundaries of the Canal Zone. It was a generous offer on our part—but it waived not one of our basic rights or interests.

All the same, the greatest real problem of the Johnson administration in this difficulty with Panama does not involve the slightest lack of right on our side. We are demonstrably in the right on any rational reading of the facts.

The real problem, instead, is the old stereotype going back to Suez, which is now a worldwide impression that when a large power takes honest steps to defend its honest rights it is somehow defending bad old "colonial interests" against clear-eyed believers in "democracy." It is a silly stereotype, apart from the simple fact that there is not a chemical trace of American "colonialism" in Panama. But to say that it is not an entrenched stereotype would be to speak nonsense.

Not surprisingly, much of the European press—notably that of Britain and France, which also still remember our self-righteousness over Suez—raises a clamor of "colonialism" against us over Panama. So do some American commentators, with sentimental sighs about the poor Panamanians so hard pressed by the wicked giant to the north, the United States.

It can only be hoped that the present Panamanian settlement will not come finally unstuck. If it does, we shall face an ugly dilemma: How to defend what in honor and in commonsense must be defeated, without at the same time coming into collision course with a U.N. precedent we helped so much to set.

Hon. Ed Foreman

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to extend to our distinguished colleague, Ed FOREMAN, my personal congratulations upon his being named by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as one of the 10 outstanding young men in the country.

Knowing him as we do from the contribution he has been making during his first term of service in the Congress, that this honor should be bestowed upon him is no surprise. His work as a Representative from the State of Texas has been outstanding.

As the senior Republican member in service on the Armed Services Committee, I am able to testify to the superior performance—truly outstanding—of our most junior member of the committee, both in years and in service. From his grasp of the various defense problems, however, he is by no means nor in any respect a junior. He has demonstrated an understanding and a maturity of judgment in Armed Services Committee matters just as he demonstrated in all his undertakings before coming to Congress. We are certainly glad to have him on our committee.

Ed FOREMAN was named one of America's outstanding young men not because he was one of the youngest men elected to Congress. Nor was he selected for this honor because of his unusual success in business before coming to Congress. This honor has come to him because of the kind of a man he is, because

of his ability and his character. His success in business and in public life merely bespeaks the quality of Ed FOREMAN.

He is one of the best in all respects. He is outstanding in all respects. And I am sure the fine people he represents appreciate the high-quality representation he has given them.

End of a PolicyEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one hardly needs to be a foreign policy expert to realize that we are in serious jeopardy in southeast Asia today. In fact we have growing trouble spots in almost every area; but we must give primary consideration to the situation in Vietnam because we have staked so much on the outcome there.

We have committed U.S. forces there; ostensibly they are there on training missions, but the training in that area unfortunately includes a high casualty rate.

We were much less than subtle in our disapproval of the Diem regime and our welcome of its successor. Yet we find the war against the Communists is going worse than before.

Having made so much of the defense of Vietnam, if we now abandon it, we will suffer irreparably elsewhere.

For these reasons I found the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of interest:

END OF A POLICY

American policy in southeast Asia has not been a complete failure—yet.

The portents are, however, ominous. Most discouraging of all was the admission by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara that the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam are more active now than before the end of the Diem regime. The United States actively connived in the revolt that threw out Diem and his relatives. The avowed purpose of this American-sponsored coup was to get more popular support for a stronger campaign against the Red Vietcong.

To date, the Washington planners and American reformers in Saigon have little but the assassination of Diem to show for their pains.

The populace of Vietnam may be friendlier. Buddhist monks are no longer immolating themselves in the streets, or if they do so, their motives are now said to be religious. However, the Vietcong operates with impunity only a few miles from Saigon, and the rice bowl area of the Mekong River Delta is said to be fairly infested with Reds.

More American servicemen have died in fighting against this elusive enemy, and more Americans are coming to admit that there is a war in progress in southeast Asia. There is no pleasure in saying "We told you so." The Star argued some time ago that the facts could not be denied.

Unlike virtue, a revolution is not its own reward. To be acceptable, it must achieve the goals for which it was begun. The

American revolution in South Vietnam is, thus far, a most unmoral spectacle.

The Diem regime, which cannot be resurrected, was said to be dictatorial, practicing such unpleasant things as press censorship. The present governing clique which rests on pure military force in South Vietnam also has resorted to closing newspapers that criticize its actions, or inactions. Whether this lesson has been lost on the liberal calamity howlers is not yet clear.

Will the State Department, and some of its unofficial policymakers, now decide that an other revolution will be good for South Vietnam? Diem couldn't win the war against the Reds. The present military dictatorship has an even worse record of wins and losses in southeast Asian competition. Will President Johnson call for some new faces in Saigon, as former President Kennedy did?

The time for making a far-reaching decision seems to be drawing closer. Will the United States defend southeast Asia against Communist expansion, even at the expense of a major effort involving American troops, or will this Nation quietly withdraw? One thing is clear. Present policy has a sorry past and a dim future.

Dr. Franz Michael's Analysis: The Sino-Soviet "Split" Is From the Common Book of Communist Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there has been an extraordinary amount of speculation concerning the origins and causes of the Sino-Soviet split, but a great deal of it has taken on a sensational nature. For example, in the last year we have repeatedly heard that the split had become irrevocable, and that nothing the two powers could do would bring them back together again. While it is probably true that relations between China and the Soviet Union will never again be the same as in past years, it would be a grave and dangerous mistake to conclude that for the same reason their goals have also become antagonistic and mutually exclusive.

While Khrushchev boasted at a New Year's reception that the only difference the Soviets had with China was over how to bury the West, not whether to bury it, we seem to indicate that we prefer Khrushchev's strategy. Mr. Speaker, we will not be less defeated if we are taken over by the Khrushchev strategy as opposed to the Maoist variety.

Dr. Franz Michael, professor of Far Eastern history and government at the University of Washington, recently visiting professor at the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies at George Washington University, and a distinguished expert on Communist affairs, has written in the fall 1963 University of Washington Alumni one of the most penetrating analyses of the Sino-Soviet struggle which I have ever read. Dr. Michael points out:

The fact that on given situations the Chinese Communist and Soviet policies do

not always agree does not necessarily weaken the effectiveness of the overall Communist effort. In fact, it may make it more formidable.

Dr. Michael then clearly states his basic view:

In my view, we face then not conflicting policies of rival totalitarian states, but the much more complex interrelationships of different strategies of attack all taken from the common book of Communist warfare. If the Communist attack is to become more sweeping, our defense must be equally broad.

I commend this outstanding analysis to my colleagues.

Tribute to Edwin W. Tiedeman, Pioneer Dairy Farm Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 31, 1964

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, appearing in the February issue of Popkess' Dairyman's Journal is a tribute to the late Edwin W. Tiedeman, pioneer dairy leader, one of the most remarkable men of I have known.

Born near O'Fallon, Ill., Ed Tiedeman went on to distinguish himself as a leading spokesman, locally and nationally, for the dairy farmer. His efforts in behalf of the dairymen will never be forgotten.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this tribute:

EDWIN W. TIEDEMAN

Edwin W. Tiedeman, 71, St. Clair County, Ill., pioneer dairy leader, whose activities reached and helped dairy farmers throughout the United States, passed to his eternal reward, suddenly, in Washington, D.C., on December 28, 1963. Services were held in St. Louis as the year was closing.

Tiedeman was born near O'Fallon, Ill., and spent his early life on the farm. His schooling included attendance at the University of Illinois, where he took various agricultural courses. He married in 1915, and launched his assiduous pioneering spirit when he established a homestead in Texas. During the World War I years, he fought a winning battle against drought and sand in the pioneering days of Texas, where the seeds were sown for a life of leadership in agriculture.

Tiedeman returned to Illinois with his family late in the 1920's, and settled on a dairy farm south of Belleville, Ill., which he operated himself, shipping on the St. Louis market.

Dairy farmers of the St. Louis milkshed were in dire need of leadership at the time, as a loosely knit group had operated in the territory for two decades. Various co-ops had been formed. Little had been accomplished. Dairy farmers themselves had lost thousands of dollars in the cooperative ventures.

HEADS PRODUCERS

Tiedeman was elected head of the milk producers of St. Clair County. He was later the unanimous choice for president of Sanitary Milk Producers at its inception in 1930. He led SMP, and the dairy farmers of several other cooperatives in the St. Louis milkshed, in the formulation of sales plans

which brought recognition to the dairy farmers resulting in several decades of improved farm dairy prices.

Tiedeman had led the dairy farmers in the St. Louis district through the bitter days of the St. Louis milk strike in 1930. He directed the organization of the St. Louis Consumers Milk Commission, a group of city residents who carried on an investigation of the system of pricing of milk to farmers which took the leaders to the dairy farms where they held meetings under shade trees and verified the claims of the dairy farmers that they were receiving insufficient returns for their labor.

Early in the campaign to lead dairymen to success, Tiedeman obtained the support of Speaker of the House of Representatives, James T. Rainey, of Carrollton, Ill., in getting the U.S. Department of Agriculture to approve a marketing agreement and license for the St. Louis market. This marketing agreement established classification for milk and minimum prices which dairy operators were required to pay farmers. This agreement was issued under the old Triple A Act, enacted early in 1933. A portion of this act was later amended and then reenacted as the Marketing Agreement Act which is the enabling legislation under which the Federal milk order program now operates in the St. Louis market as well as some 80 markets in the United States.

Tiedeman was not only responsible for obtaining the first marketing agreement for the St. Louis market but was also the leader in continuing the Federal milk marketing program in the St. Louis market which has come to be the oldest Federal order in the United States.

WENT TO WISCONSIN

As the World War II clouds were gathering in 1942, Tiedeman left the St. Louis area and went to Appleton, Wisc., where he led a group of dairy farmers, including seven local co-operative organizations, into a central sales agency. Offices were opened in Chicago. Wisconsin dairymen received millions of dollars of increased benefits as a result of the sales group.

Shortly after leaving as manager of Central Sales Agency, Tiedeman was appointed director of the Dairy Branch of the Office of Price Stabilization, a war agency during the Korean war. Following the war years and his work with the Government, he was appointed director of dairy marketing of the American Farm Bureau Federation where he led in the establishment of the dairy program of the largest farmers' organization in the United States. Upon retirement from the American Farm Bureau, Tiedeman was appointed to the staff of the Dairy Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in this assignment he had the responsibility of checking qualifications of cooperatives which operate under the Federal milk market program. He continued this activity until his death.

Tiedeman served many years as a member of the board of the National Milk Producers Federation and as a board member and chairman of the National Dairy Council.

Ed Tiedeman was the most determined and diligent dairy farm leader who developed in the St. Louis milk shed in the past half century. His principles and preachings were sound. The results of his untiring effort in behalf of the dairy farmers of the midwest and the United States will live forever.

A farm boy with ambition, and knowledge, and leadership, and determination, and ability, and humility, has returned millions of dollars to dairy farmers of the Nation. It can be truly said that Ed spent his life in the service of his fellow dairymen.

Ed Tiedeman will be missed in the industry. His name and accomplishments will live forever in the pages of agricultural history.